UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/587,616	06/13/2007	06/13/2007 Wilfried Maier		9956	
	7590 09/08/201 THENNISCH PC	EXAMINER			
29 W LAWREN			NGUYEN, PHONG H		
SUITE 210 PONTIAC, MI 48342			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3724		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/08/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/587,616	MAIER ET AL.	
	Examiner	A 4 1 14	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHONG H. NGUYEN	3724	

	PHONG H. NGUYEN	3724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	n. LED WITHIN TWO
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT »);	ΓE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	·	,	,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	✓ will not be entered, or b) ✓ will ided below or appended. ✓ will not be entered, or b) ✓ will not be entered, o	I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>18,19,30,32-36,39 and 42.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>21-29,37,38,40,41</u>	<u>,43 and 44</u> .		
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•		
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Phong H Nguyen/ Examiner, Art Unit 3724 September 7, 2010		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The expression "to assist in pilling up" changes the scope of the claims and therefore presents possible new issues that require further search and consideration since claim 42 is not obviously allowable over prior art.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 42 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 42 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph has been withdrawn.

Regarding the Applicant's argument with respect to the rejection of claim 18 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, before the slices are piled up, the slices have a tear-drop cross-section on the convey 2. After the slices are piled up on the conveyor 7, they still have a tear-drop cross-section. Therefore, there is no change in shape of the slice before and after piling the slices.

Regarding the Applicant's argument with respect to the rejection of claim 18 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, claim 42 depends on claim 1. Therefore, claim 42 should further limit claim 1. However, the language of claim 42 is directed to the embodiment in Fig. 3 in which the conveyor belts displace relative together in a vertical direction. Therefore, the rejection of claim 42 is proper.

Regarding the restriction of claim 37, 38, 40, 41, 43 and 44, the original claim 37 does not have the limitation "detecting at least one characteristic of the food product block to be sliced" and that limitation was already restricted in the Restriction requirement dated 10/27/2008. Therefore, it is proper for the Examiner to withdrawn claims that are directed to the detecting means according to 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Regarding the Applicant's argument with respect to 35 USC 103 rejection, in claim 18 when the slices are piled up, they slightly change their shapes due to their weight and the pushing action. In claim 39, Wiley teaches the first conveyor belt assisting folding the slices in Fig. 3. Claim 42 is directed to a different embodiment that is not supported by claim 18.